

**REMARKS**

Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action dated October 21, 2003. Applicant desires consideration of the enclosed amendment. None of the proposed amendments require further search or consideration; rather, the amendments clearly place the application in condition for allowance. Consequently, the amendment should be entered.

**The Office Action**

Claims 1-14, 16 and 17 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-7, 12-14 and 16 have been allowed.

Claims 8-10 and 17 are rejected.

Claim 11 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**The Claims Distinguish over the References of Record**

Claim 8 now calls for a containment structure contoured about a periphery of the reflector. The references fail to teach a containment structure contoured about a periphery of the reflector in combination with the remaining limitations of the claim. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 8 and claims 9, 10, and 17 dependent therefrom distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 11 distinguishes patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

**Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they do not include reference to "SC" (page 4, line 18). Enclosed herewith is a substitute drawing page including Figures 1 and 4 whereby figure 1 includes the "SC" reference.

**CONCLUSION**

Each issued raised in the Office Action dated October 21, 2003 has been addressed.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of the claims in the present application. However, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's statement for reasons for allowance. Specifically, claim 1 is directed to a combination of features as initially stated by the Examiner. The remainder of the statement regarding a particular limitation of claim 1 is traversed if construed to imply that patentability resides in a single limitation.

All formal and informal matters have been addressed. Again, the proposed amendments merely place the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, the amendment should be entered since no new issues and no further searching is required.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

21 January 2004  
Date

Timothy E. Nauman  
Timothy E. Nauman  
Reg. No. 32,283  
Karl W. Hauber  
Reg. No. 52,999  
1100 Superior Avenue  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582